

**October 2000 ASC X12 Rebuttal Ballot Package**  
**Ballot Comment Log**  
**Page 3**

**DM or TS Number:     DM 176300**

**Company:**            **Linda Newerla, I.M.**  
**Voter:**             Linda J. Newerla  
**Vote:**              Disapprove

I continue to disapprove DM 176300. The TAS response did not address my comment adequately. New code "MRN" is a number assigned to the medical record number of the mother whereas the expanded definition says it's a number assigned to the mother. For example, the mother ID number could be 12345 and the medical record or records could be ABCDE. The code definition and expanded definition are in conflict.

**DM or TS Number:     DM 177300**

**Company:**            Peter Randlev, I.M.  
**Voter:**             Peter Randlev  
**Vote:**              Disapprove

DM 177300 Disapprove

There is no argument that this code addition to data element 128 of UIC "Unit Identification Code" with the associated code source meets the requirement of the DoD as stated by the Technical Assessment subcommittee response. But, it can lead to confusion for other users because of its limited use without the name properly specifying the restricted use. It will not hurt the application by the DoD in any way to modify the code name to "Department of Defense Unit Identification Code". Or can the DoD representative show how it impairs their use of the proposed code. In spite of what the Technical Assessment Subcommittee says in their response, you don't use a code source to define a code. It's either done in the name of the code or in its expanded definition. A hospital and a manufacturing plant are just two examples outside the DoD that require unit identification. To modify the name costs nothing and does head off future potential problems.

**DM or TS Number:     DM 182300**

**Company:**            **Peter Randlev, I.M.**  
**Voter:**             Peter Randlev  
**Vote:**              Disapprove

DM 182300 Disapprove

C001 was designed to prevent the requirement for adding multiples of base units to code list 355. There is a Design Guideline for using C001 rather than to keep adding new multiples. Let's follow the recommendation of the Guideline. Thus, once again, this disapproval follows the X12 Design Rules and Guidelines. The Guidelines are a true part of the Design Rules and Guidelines. There is no need to add a code 1T "Derabecquerel" to data element 355. Let us use the X12 standards as they were designed and not always try to get around them. The Technical Assessment response says that "three of the four necessary codes already exist in DE355 ..". By the use of C001 it is only necessary to use one of these four codes. Use C001 whenever appropriate! C001 has been part of X12 standards for many years. Use it.